THE REPORTER

VOL. V, No. 10 | *For Conscience' Sake* | JUNE - JULY, 1947

Public Opinion Polls

The results of the public opinion polls on the question of universal military training depend on how the question is presented. While the sample surveys have repeatedly shown a heavy majority of the American people in favor of universal military training, the results are significantly changed when an alternative is offered.

Further study of the reasons given for supporting universal military training diminishes the importance of these polls which have been used extensively by the War Department in its drive to sell universal military training to Congress and to the public.

The difference in the results of the polls when an alternative is offered is shown in a report released by the National Opinion Research Center, University of Denver, Colorado. Asked whether they favored a year of compulsory military training for boys during peacetime, 72% of the people answered "yes", 20% answered "no" and 8% were undecided. But when asked whether they would rather have the Government spend $2,000,000,000 on a program of better education in the schools or on a program of compulsory military training in the Army or Navy, 56% preferred that the money be spent for regular education, only 25% favored compulsory military training, 11% favored neither or both, and 8% were undecided.

Many people apparently hope that universal military training will solve or reduce juvenile delinquency or improve health and education although the President's Advisory Commission has declared that these needs could be served better by strengthening the existing agencies in these fields. In a *Washington Post* poll released June 9, 76% of Washington, D. C. citizens favored universal military training, 20% opposed it, and 4% were undecided. But the *Post* also reported that "60% of those favoring universal military training thought the training would be good for young men in many ways—physically, psychologically, and educationally. Only 42% mentioned the military necessity of building up an army in case of future wars." Thus, less than one-half would approve universal military training on the grounds of military security—the only basis justified by the Commission.

The last survey of the Gallup Institute of Public Opinion, Princeton, New Jersey, released on July 26, shows 75% of the population favoring universal military training, 18% opposed, and 7% undecided. In twelve surveys taken by the Institute on this subject since December 1942, only twice did the majority favoring universal military training fall as low as 63%. The average is around 70%.

The Gallup polls, however, never offer an alternative proposal so that the voters must vote on a single issue and cannot make a choice from a comparison

(*Continued on Page* 4)

SONG OF A PACIFIST

PAULINE BRIDGE HENDERSON

The world today has not a space for me.
Its teeming millions worked to win a war,
Inspired and led, each by its orator
Who blared his brand of truth through land and sea.
So man in killing man is proud to be
The one victorious. The conqueror
Laughs loud and feasts and drinks above the gore,
And tries to make men feel that they are free.
So World, forgive my pausing here apart.
In time the human race will abnegate
Its greed and lies, and know a loving heart
Will liberate mankind. Such is my state;
To view the world's brief progress on my chart
And hope its wisdom does not come too late.

—*Friends Intelligencer.*

$1,247,018.15

A check for $17,777.54 sent on July 25 to the Treasury of the United States closed out the NSB Farm Accounts which recorded the wages paid to conscientious objectors for farm labor and dairy herd testing and brought the final total of the Frozen Fund to $1,247,018.15. The efforts to get the money appropriated for world relief during the recent session of Congress were unsuccessful.

The wages of these assignees, which were paid by farmers and testing associations, were held in special deposits in the United States Treasury by regulation of Selective Service. On March 7, 1947, the money was covered into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. Efforts had been made to have the money expended for international relief purposes in accordance with the wishes of Civilian Public Service assignees polled by *The Reporter*. With the money transferred from these special accounts to the general receipts it required an Act of Congress to get the money for this purpose.

On June 12, Mrs. Betty Jacob, representing the National Service Board, testified before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services in support of H. R. 1938, which would authorize the appropriation of the Frozen Fund for expenditure to the International Children's Emergency Fund, an organization of the United Nations. This resolution was introduced by Rep. Cole of New York.

(*Continued on Page* 2)

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

Box 1636, Washington 13, D. C., has been discontinued by the National Service Board. All correspondence to its office and to *The Reporter* should be sent to the following street address: 941 Massachusetts Ave., N. W., Washington 1, D. C.

House Committee O.K.'s C. O. Amendments to Training Bill

Three amendments submitted by the National Service Board to strengthen the provisions for conscientious objectors under universal military training were accepted by a subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee in its revised bill for peacetime training which was approved by the full Committee on July 25, two days before Congress adjourned.

The amendments broadened the definition of a conscientious objector, specified private as well as public agencies to handle the training of conscientious objectors, and obtained pay, dependency allowances, and compensation and burial payments for conscientious objectors equal to those received by military trainees.

The Armed Services Committee had not taken up for consideration any of the several bills for universal military training introduced in the present Congress. On July 9 Rep. Towe (R.-N. J.), chairman of Subcommittee No. 2 on Training and Education, introduced a new bill. The full Committee concluded its hearings on July 11 and the question of further hearings and the consideration of all bills on the subject were referred to the Towe Subcommittee. Only two days of hearings were allowed by the Subcommittee which heard Dr. Allan Bates, scientist, and Dr. William G. Mather of the Northern Baptist Convention, who both opposed universal military training, and representatives of the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps who favored it. One week later, July 19, the Subcommittee reported out its revised bill, H. R. 4278, for universal military training.

The original Towe bill incorporated the general recommendations of the President's Advisory Commission which urged a program of universal military training in its report of May 29. It was also the first of any of the bills introduced to include any provisions for conscientious objectors. The President's Commission, while rejecting complete exemption, had recommended alternate training of a non-military character, exclusive civilian control, and equal benefits, advantages, privileges and safeguards including pay and dependency. These recommendations were largely included in the Towe bill although it was felt that several necessary provisions were omitted.

In the short time available for amending the bill, the National Selective Board submitted four amendments. The original bill specified only public agencies which were approved, selected or created by the National Security Training Commission for handling the training of conscientious objectors. As amended, the bill now includes private agencies. Thus, churches and non-profit religious

(*Continued on Page* 3)

THE REPORTER

Vol. V., No. 10 June - July, 1947

Published monthly in the interests of peace, freedom of conscience and related activities.
NATIONAL SERVICE BOARD for RELIGIOUS OBJECTORS
941 Mass. Ave., N. W., Washington 1, D. C.

Subscription price:
Foreign or Domestic, $1.00 per year.

Letters

May 31, 1947

"We are deeply grateful as the parents of an absolutist C. O. that you will continue in the interest of conscientious objectors. . . . Your paper alone seems to be continuing the emphasis on conscientious objectors held during the war. This is no time to give it up. Only through this means exemplified by these men can peace come to the world.

Mrs. M."

Wake Forrest, N. C.

"Dear Sirs:

"I wish you wouldn't send me *The Reporter* any more.

"I had two C. O. camps under my supervision all during the war. I defended the C. O.'s against unfair attack in the beginning and at the last when the work output was an absurdity. I felt that those who really had conscientious objections should be protected in their right. I'm beginning to feel differently now. *The Reporter* is largely responsible for this change of thought.

"I wish you would stop attempting to convince us that all the people in the C. O. camps were little pure white angels whose halos glow like neon signs both day and night. The martyr pose gets awfully tiresome to one who knows that a lot of the people in the C. O. camps were cranks, crackpots, shirkers, cowards, and just plain bums. It sickens me to see the truth so cloyingly evaded. You know even if you don't admit it, that a lot of people in the C. O. camps had no religious scruples. As a matter of fact, they had neither religion nor scruples.

"You *should* know that in some camps these little pure white angels piddled around on work projects until their aggregate output was far less than that of the kid CCC camps of comparable size.

"You should know how the sick list went up when the weather *looked* bad. You should know that some of the little angels were so filthy dirty that even a strong stomach had to keep up wind. You should know about the filthy barracks the little angels lived in by choice. And how about the beer parties and how about the time I had to insist that certain women be put out of camp?

"I still think I'm tolerant, but isn't there a limit to toleration somewhere? I'm sure the work agency was far more tolerant of the philosophies, vagaries and idiosyncrasies of the C. O.'s than the C. O.'s were of the ideals of the work agency.

"I don't guess it would hurt your cause much (with some of us at least) if you would present the C. O. picture as it was and not all messed up with sticky misleading idealism and definite suppression of ugly truths. Frankly, I'm sick of it, and come the next war, I guess I'll be ready to say the N.S.B.R.O. made a mess of things and since they persist in wallowing in the mess, I'll cast my vote for some more realistic outfit.

J. H."

Portland, Oregon.

Hutchins on U. M. T.

Robert M. Hutchins, Chancellor of the University of Chicago and long-time opponent of universal military training, made a recent statement in which he gave his military objections to such training. Military security was given as the only justification for compulsory military training in the report by the President's Commission which acknowledged that health, education, and character "could be secured more surely and more appropriately through a strengthening of the existing agencies in these fields". The recent statement of Hutchins strikes on the very ground argued by the military. He points out the significant imperative that because we have no defense against the atomic bomb we will have to actually beat war itself.

In his statement Hutchins claims that the military experts contradict themselves. He declared, "The generals and admirals all insist on the rapidity of technical change. Then they insist that men trained with old weapons are going to be effective in using entirely new weapons. They prove that there is no defense against the atomic bomb, and then ask for an enormous army to defend us against it. They convince us that in an atomic war 40,000,000 of us will be killed in one night and then claim that it will be helpful to us to have wasted two or three billion dollars a year in teaching millions of men close-order drill."

Hutchins reiterated the warning of scientists when he frankly stated "there is no defense against the atomic bomb. This means that there is no way of preventing the destruction of the cities of the United States, for nobody seriously supposes that there is a 'secret' of the atomic bomb which the United States can keep. If we cannot beat the atomic bomb we will have to beat war. There is no other way in which we can save our cities from the fate of Hiroshima and Nagasaki."

The matter of training for the aftermath of an atomic disaster is relatively unimportant, says Hutchins, for the majority of the population will be killed. He believes that the survivors would need scientfiic and industrial training, but military training is unrealistic. "Professor Einstein," Hutchins said, "thinks that about two-thirds of the population will be killed and that is certainly a conservative estimate. But of all the kinds of training which the one-third surviving might need, the most useless is military training."

$1,247,018.15—(from page 1)

The attitude of the subcommittee members during the hearing was favorable. Rep. Cole, in his comments, referred to the work of conscientious objectors in Puerto Rico and Rep. Sikes of Florida praised their contribution to public health in his state. The subcommittee reported the bill favorably to the full committee which then passed it on to the House of Representatives.

When the bill came to the floor of the House it passed without a dissenting vote. In the Senate, however, the objection of Sen. Arthur H. Vandenberg (R-Mich.) blocked the passage of the bill and it failed in a similar manner the second time.

The reason for Vandenberg's objection is not clear but it is understood that he believes the Frozen Fund is an unfair means of getting additional money from the United States Government which has already granted $15,000,000 to the Children's Fund. An additional appropriation of $25,000,000 is authorized on condition that the Children's Fund raise $30,000,000 from other governments. Vandenberg apparently regards the Frozen Fund, which is private in origin, as a government gift which could be used to get additional money from the Government.

Ultimate appropriation of the Frozen Fund is doubtful. Interested persons agree that it will become increasingly difficult to obtain Congressional approval. If this is true the money will be merely absorbed in the general receipts of the Treasury.

The $1,247,018.15 would supply a supplementary meal of 500 calories each day to 100,000 children for one year on the basis of the Children's Fund plan as outlined by Maurice Pate, the director. The Fund's share of the cost of feeding each child averages about $13 per year. Each meal, according to Pate, costs about six cents per child but the recipient country contributes from one-quarter to three-quarters of the cost of the meal. The money would be used to feed children in those countries formerly receiving relief from UNRRA.

The assignees who earned the money were paid the prevailing wage in the area of their work. In Arkansas this amounted to fifteen cents per hour or $31.50 per month without board and room while in King County, Washington, the rate was as high as $175 per month with board and room furnished. Of their wages assignees on detached service projects received a monthly allowance of $15 plus most of their medical expenses. The remainder went to the Frozen Fund.

Directory Corrections

Butman, James H., R.F.D. 2, Winthrop, Maine, b. 1922, CPS 19, 108, 2-17-43—12-20-43; Friend, salesman.

Cassett, James B., 2618 Maryland Ave., Cincinnati 4, Ohio, b. 1911, CPS 8, 72, 28, 140, 18, 7-31-42—3-4-46; Church of Christ, linotype operator.

Huffman, George E., Route 2, Deer Park, Washington, b. 1919, CPS 56, 97, 9-5-44—3-3-46; Disciples of Christ, dairy tester.

Kafka, Joseph R., 8335 Langley Ave., Chicago 19, Ill., b. 1906, CPS 46, 23, 3-10-44—3-12-45; Friend, clerk.

Knepp, Clair E., 313 S. Walnut St., Orrville, Ohio, b. 1919, CPS 35, 103, 6-2-41—12-10-45; Mennonite, dairy farmer.

Pratt, Robert E., 185 Washington Ave., Hamden 14, Conn., b. 1907, CPS 32, 108, 37, 1-18-43—11-14-45; Methodist, carpenter.

Rickerman, Henry G., 731 Panmure Rd., Haverford, Pa., b. 1909, CPS 76, 8-1-42—11-15-45; Friend, student, recreation worker.

Roodenko, Igal, 1117 Manor Ave., New York 59, N. Y., b. 1917, CPS 52, 111, 2-9-43; student.

Seymour, Richard B., Lancaster, Mass., b. 1922, CPS 53, 59, 114, 115, 140, 12-8-42—5-16-46; Congregational Christian, student.

Stutzman, Orville R., Garden City, Mo., b. 1926, CPS 18, 31, 86, 12-5-44; Mennonite, farmer.

Thompson, Eugene H., Jr., 104 Cochran Road, Lexington, Ky., b. 1914, CPS 19, 37, 41, 11-6-42—4-5-46; Episcopal, teacher.

German Pacifists Meet

German pacifists who are members of the War Resisters' International held their first post-war conference in Hamburg, June 14-16.

According to *Peace News*, an English pasifist weekly, the conferees represented groups in Berlin, Aachen, Dortmund, Frieberg, Hanover, Stuttgart, Munich, and Hamburg. In addition to the German representatives a delegate from Denmark, Holland, and Sweden attended as well as a representative of the Peace Pledge Union of England.

It was reported by *Peace News* that the conference, convened largely as the result of the initiative and enthusiasm of Dr. Theodor Michaltsheff of Hamburg, carried on discussions of violence and non-violence and East-West relations and heard reports on the growth of the War Resisters' International and the British Resistance movement since September, 1939.

Hearing Denied

Rep. Philbin (D-Mass.) has voiced disapproval of the short hearings on the question of universal military training in the House Armed Services Committee. A number of organizations and individuals were allowed to testify on the principle of compulsory military training until a specific resolution was introduced on July 9 incorporating the recommendations of the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training. After that date only four days of hearings were held and at least one representative stated, on the day the Subcommittee reported the bill favorably, that he had not had time to read it.

In his remarks, Rep. Philbin said: "Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee on July 21 presented a list of organizations and witnesses which testified for and against the subject of universal military training.

"It ought to be clear that the great bulk of these organizations and witnesses testified in 1945, almost two years prior to the recent hearings. Many organizations which were heard two years ago have raised a question about the propriety of excluding them from public hearings this time. They point out that in 1945 we were in a state of hostilities, that the report of the President's Commission on Universal Training was not then before them, that there is an entirely different international situation now which requires comment and discussion. Furthermore, they point out that the bill which the Armed Services Committee considered was not printed until Thursday, July 10, 1947, and they therefore have had no opportunity to study or present testimony on it . . .

"That the House may know the individuals and organizations who were heard in the recent hearings, I append a list of the dates and persons who presented testimony before the Committee and Subcommittee on Armed Services:

June 11, 1947
Dr. Karl Compton (For)
June 18, 1947
Rev. Edmund A. Walsh (For)
June 19, 1947
Rev. Daniel Poling (For)
Mr. Truman Gibson (For)
June 27, 1947
Citizens' Emergency Committee for Universal Training, Justice Owen Roberts testifying (For)
July 7, 1947
Philadelphia Committee Against Peacetime Conscription (Ag.)
Women's Committee to Oppose Conscription (Ag.)
American Legion Auxiliary (For)
July 9, 1947
Socialist Party (Ag.)
American Legion (For)
American Veterans' Committee (Ag.)
Progressive Citizens of America (For)
July 10, 1947
Synagogue Council of America (Ag.)
Father Dan Laning, individual, from Texas (For)
Woman's Christian Temperance Union (Ag.)
Dr. Blake Van Leer, individual, president, Georgia Tech. (For)
CIO (Ag.)
Rabbi Michael Aronson, DAV (For)
July 11, 1947
Rep. Adam Clayton Powell (Ag.)
Southern Baptist Convention (Ag.)
Association of Junior Colleges (Ag.)
Post War World Council (Ag.)
July 16, 1947
Dr. Allan Bates, scientist, from Chicago (Ag.)
Veterans of Foreign Wars (For)
July 17, 1947
The War Department, three officers (For)
The Navy Department, three officers (For)
The Marine Corps, two officers (For)
The Northern Baptist Convention (Ag.)

"Mr. Speaker, clearly the peacetime draft bill was jammed through the committee without giving an adequate hearing to very many groups which desired and had requested an opportunity to be heard. No good purpose can be served by this procedure. I hope that the next session of Congress will insist upon full hearing on this vital matter."

The Mennonite Central Committee and the Church of the Brethren asked for permission to testify on university military training but were not permitted to do so. It is reported that more than 100 organizations were denied the opportunity of appearing before the Committee to testify on this legislation.

TRAINING BILL—(from page 1)

agencies, approved by the Commission, are eligible to operate training programs.

The second amendment clarifies the designation of "trainee" in the National Security Training Act, as the bill is called, to include conscientious objectors. In its original form the exact status of conscientious objectors seemed obscure. However, a former attorney of the NSB, after careful reading of the Act, gave the opinion that in the overall reading of the bill the use of the word "trainee" includes conscientious objectors. At one point the Act specifies that "non-military trainees shall not be subject to the code of conduct" which applies to trainees taking military training. While "non-military trainees" indirectly implies conscientious objectors it also includes the physically or mentally handicapped persons who are required to take training. The amendment, which was accepted, prevents an interpretation of the Act which would discriminate against conscientious objectors with respect to pay, dependency allowances, compensation and burial payments.

The third amendment broadens the definition of conscientious objectors to include persons opposed to military training by reason of humanitarian convictions. The original wording of the bill was limited to the wording of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 which specified "by reason of religious training and belief". This definition which limited conscience to religious grounds, had caused some conscientious objectors to encounter considerable difficulty from their local boards despite a liberal interpretation which had been given by National Headquarters and the courts. The amended passage in the bill now reads:

"Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to require any person to be subject to combatant or noncombatant training who, by reason of religious training and belief, or humanitarian convictions, is conscientiously opposed to partcipating in military training in any form."

A fourth amendment was submitted for the purpose of amending the appeal provisions for persons denied a conscientious objector classification by their local board. This amendment was rejected by the Committee.

A second attempt to amend the bill in full Committee to allow for complete exemption and to insure fairness in appeal procedure failed because the bill was "frozen". After the Subcommittee had reported out the revised bill, H. R. 4278, the full Committee refused to consider any amendments.

The full exemption amendment provided that conscientious objectors opposed to both military and non-military training should be relieved from liability for either military or non-military training.

The appeal amendment provided that a person who is denied a conscientious objector classification by his local board and who is brought up for a hearing shall be informed of his right to examine evidence and to choose counsel to appear with him.

The amendments were based on the statement of the representatives of the National Service Board meeting in Washington, D. C., on April 11, 1947. A report of this meeting was given in the April issue of *The Reporter*. The representatives to this meeting approved a proposed section for alternative training in the event that universal military training became law.

The proposed section sought to correct the defects in the provisions for CO's under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. This statement, while not necessarily representing the position of any one church or group represented in NSB, was acceptable to all groups as an alternative training plan.

The final bill, H. R. 4278, reported favorably by the full Committee on Armed Services in the House, now goes to the Rules Committee where it will be in a position for early action in the next session which opens January 2, 1948, unless a special session is called this fall.

Meanwhile ,the Senate Committee on Armed Services, which had no hearings on universal military training during the first session, is reported to be considering the possibility of conducting hearings during the recess.

Naturalization

The recent decision of the Supreme Court enabling alien conscientious objectors to become naturalized is threatened by a bill before Congress requiring applicants for citizenship to promise to bear arms.

Rep. James I. Dolliver (R.-Iowa) introduced a bill, H. R. 2286, to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 so that persons applying for citizenship in the United States, in addition to fulfilling residence requirements, must promise to bear arms in support and defense of the United States, if required.

Alien C. O.'s have become citizens under the recent decision of the Supreme Court in the *Girouard* v. *U. S.* case (see Feb. and Mar. *Reporters*) which ruled that Congress, in prescribing the oath of naturalization, did not intend to prescribe as a test of naturalization a promise to bear arms. In this decision the Court reversed its former position upholding the policy of the Department of Immigration and Naturalization which refused to permit applicants to take the oath if they were unwilling to bear arms. This policy was based on an interpretation by immigration officials of the oath "to support and defend" the Constitution.

(*Continued on Page* 4)

Sec. 562, P. L. & R.
U. S. POSTAGE
1c PAID
Washington, D. C.
Permit No. 5540

NATURALIZATION—(from page 3)

Under the Dolliver bill the oath of naturalization would be amended to include in specific terms the promise to bear arms in support and defense of the United States, if required.

It is understood that the "if required" clause is intended to satisfy the objections of pacifists who have conscientious scruples against bearing arms. When it is remembered that this bill was introduced to prevent the naturalization of persons who are unwilling to bear arms this seems like a very weak "out". It literally means that alien C. O.'s could no longer become citizens.

Hearings on this bill were held June 30 before the Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee. The Friends Committee on National Legislation, the Church of the Brethren, the Mennonite Central Committee, the American Civil Liberties Union, and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom testified against the measure. Although the bill was reported to the full Committee with amendments, no further action was taken.

POLLS—(from page 1)

of two or more possibilities. If the question centered on preparedness measures, the evidence in the *Post* poll shows that universal military training would draw a much smaller share of votes.

Although the Gallup Institute does not report the percentages for each reason given for supporting universal military training it does claim that preparedness is "one of the major reasons" and that "the second reason given in favor of peacetime training is that a taste of military discipline and orderliness would be good for the young men".

It appears from these reasons that many people look to military training to strengthen the qualities and traits of character developed in the home, the school, and the church, despite the fact that our increased crime wave and juvenile delinquency follow in the wake of the greatest program of military training this country ever had. The controls produced by military discipline are largely external and temporary. Compulsory military training has not produced either in Europe or America the type of character needed for long-term citizenship.

The reliability of public opinion polls for determining public attitudes was discussed in a recent subcommittee meeting of the House Armed Services Committee which heard Dr. William G. Mather, chairman of the Council on Christian Social Progress of the Northern Baptist Convention, testify against universal military training. Dr. Mather, a sociologist, was asked by a Committee member to comment on the results of the Gallup poll which show a majority of the public in favor of universal military training.

"As a sociologist," Dr. Mather said, "I have had something to do with the determining of public opinion; that is, in certain experiments of our own. I am quite aware of the fact that the way questions are stated and the people to whom they are put will often influence the answer. I do not trust the Gallup poll too far. In fact, sir, I do not even trust my own polls of public opinion too far, knowing all the bugs that can get into them."

The Gallup Institute has seemingly taken an editorial position favoring universal military training. It never offers an alternative in its frequent polls on this subject. It points out that "peacetime training is one of those issues on which the minority side is apt to bring more pressure to bear on Congress than the majority." In its latest release the Institute claims its polls prove that letters to Congressmen are unreliable as an index of public opinion. It cites the analysis in the Public Opinion Quarterly of 30,000 letters received in 1940 by fourteen Senators in which 90% of the letters opposed Selective Service and only 10% were in favor. The Gallup polls found 68% of the people in favor of the bill, 27% opposed and 5% with no opinion. In reference to peacetime military training the Gallup Institute claims, on the basis of its latest poll, that Congress is hearing from the 18% who oppose it.

Most Americans, as represented by their church, education, and labor leaders, are opposed to universal military training. The major churches, labor, and educational organizations have gone on record against it. The Gallup polls, however, without an alternative, show a majority of the population in favor of it. This contrast is illustrated in a letter from Frederick J. Libby, executive secretary of the National Council for Prevention of War, to Representative Towe (R-N. J.), chairman of the committee charged with refusing fair hearings on the bill. Mr. Libby says that the "superficiality of Gallup polls purporting to show a majority of American people as supporting military training is plainly revealed by the great national strength of the informed opposition that is represented" by the opposing organizations not yet heard. His letter included the names of twenty-one national organizations opposing military training which were denied a hearing.

Public opinion polls, like other matter, need to be read with thought and analysis. When 60% of the voters favoring universal military training believe that young men need military discipline they seem to be expressing their disgust with youth and a losing faith in the ability of the church, the home, and the school to develop the qualities of honesty, self-control, and respect which issue into the type of character needed for good citizenship. Delegating that job to the military appears then to be not only an admission of failure but a further desire to escape the responsibility for youth, the home, and its allied institutions. The polls reveal that an insufficient number of the members of opposing organizations realize the dangers of UMT.

JOB OPPORTUNITY

Dairy Farmer: Man, married or single, wanted as co-worker on mountain dairy farm. Race, creed, color of no import, but would prefer religious pacifist who pursues the lonely way beyond political groups or church sects. One who cherishes the writings of Tolstoi and the music of Mozart would be especially welcome, but any warm-hearted fellow-sinner who will not shy away from the sweet monotony of toil in hot summer fields will be gladly received. Write: James P. Cooney, Morning Star Farm, Haydenville, RFD, Mass.

National Council Against Conscription

Organized in November, 1945, to do educational and political work against peacetime conscription, the National Council Against Conscription is based on the belief that universal military training is one of the vital issues which will promote or block the making of peace in the ten years that are left to us.

The problem, as stated by Dr. Arthur H. Compton, Nobel Prize winner and brother to Dr. Karl Compton, the chairman of the President's Advisory Commission, is based on the prediction that within a decade "all of the principal nations will be fully equipped with atom bombs and other modern weapons of destruction." This prediction is supported by other eminent scientists.

The platform of the National Council is "cooperative endeavor based on international morality." In the words of the Council "our only hope of security is the same as that of every nation—namely, total peace together." While pointing out the evils of compulsory military training, the group takes a positive stand for strengthening international government.

In addition to publishing a weekly bulletin called *Conscription News* the Council has recently released four leaflets: "The Brasshat and The Atom", "The Army Says . . .", "Ask the Man Who Owned One", and "True or False".

The Council derives its support from voluntary contributions and from individual and bulk subscriptions to *Conscription News*.

The Council has an imposing list of members from a wide range of occupations and interest and is not limited to strictly pacifist opponents of conscription.

The acting director of the organization is John Swomley, associate secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, who works on a voluntary basis with headquarters at 1013-18th Street, N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

Many men in Civilian Public Service camps in the past two years were active in the work against peacetime conscription through writing letters to newspaper editors, to Congressmen, and through arousing their friends. Since these men are no longer in CPS, they may be doing less now to defeat this issue. The National Council Against Conscription will send suggestions for action to those persons who write for them.